

01
02
03
04
05
06
07
08 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
09 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
10 AT SEATTLE

11 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,) No. 05-287M
12)
13 Plaintiff,)
14) ORDER DENYING
15 v.) STIPULATED MOTION
16) TO EXTEND TIME
17 AISHA MEREDITH, a/k/a)
18 Erlinda Soriano, and)
19 JESSICA HENDERSON, a/k/a)
20 Maureen O'Malley Davis,)
21 Defendants.)
22)


23 On June 30, 2005, the parties to the above-captioned matter filed a Stipulated Motion
24 to Extend Time to File Indictment. Dkt. No. 16. The motion argued that granting a
25 continuance would satisfy the “ends of justice” by providing the parties additional time to
26 prepare for their case.

27 Congress, however, “did not intend the ‘ends of justice’ exclusion to be granted as a
28 matter of course but rather [intended it] to be used sparingly and only when necessary.”
29 *United States v. Lewis*, 980 F.2d 555, 560 (9th Cir. 1992) (internal citations omitted). Hence,
30 an “ends of justice” exclusion may be granted only for a specific duration when “justified by
31 the record with reference to the facts.” *United States v. Ramirez-Cortez*, 213 F.3d 1149, 1154

01 (9th Cir. 1999) (internal citations and punctuation omitted). Generalized assertions that the
02 “ends of justice” will be satisfied by the granting of a continuance are insufficient. *Id.* at 1154-
03 55.

04 Here, the parties have provided no evidence, nor adduced any facts from the record
05 sufficient to justify granting a continuance. Rather, they have simply alleged, without
06 explaining in reference to specific facts, that more time would enable them to prepare more
07 thoroughly. These reasons are insufficient to justify a continuance. The parties’ motion is
08 therefore DENIED.

09 DATED this 5th day of July, 2005.

10
11 
12 JAMES P. DONOHUE
13 United States Magistrate Judge
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26